

**Gallatin County Planning Board
Infrastructure Committee
Water and Wastewater Subcommittee
Record of Meeting: September 22, 2008**

Members present: C.B. Dormire (Subcommittee Chair), Don Seifert, Kerry White; Sean O'Callaghan, County Planning Department.

1. **Call to Order:** 4:00
2. **Approval of Meeting Minutes from August 18 & 25, 2008 and September 8, 2008**
Minutes approved as drafted

3. **Discussion of Additional Consulting Engineering Study:**

CB handed out a document titled "Revised tentative discussion draft summary memorandum of CBD's understanding of Wastewater and Water Subcommittee discussions to date concerning the scope and substance of a further Consulting Engineering Study, 17 September 2008"

Sean talked about his discussions with Greg Sullivan and Randy Johnson to try and determine maximum buildout densities. Sean said the Planning Department is not comfortable coming up with numbers for maximum buildout densities in the Bozeman Donut, Belgrade Donut, or for the Four Corners and Gallatin Gateway Zoning Districts because these numbers are still largely abstract, and involve unresolved issues, but that further clarification will be provided in the coming months as draft documents are developed and released for public comments.

CB requested that Sean instead provide the existing maximum buildout densities within the Bozeman Donut and the Belgrade Donut.

Don asked if we could look at the density of built-out subdivisions to develop trends of what type of density results as land is converted from agricultural to residential subdivision.

Kerry questioned why we would want to do this?

CB stated that the purpose of density assumptions is so the consultant can evaluate the demand that maximum build-out would place on a potential wastewater treatment system and provide recommendations appropriately.

The group agreed to consider using average densities from a range of projects approved in recent years for B.1(a)(ii). Sean and Kerry agreed to work on this based on a list that

Jennifer Madgic provided to the Planning Board (and as updated appropriately). Sean and Kerry will develop a concept and run it by the group before any additional research is done. CB asked how/if the group wants the study to effect what may be proposed under Growth Policy Implementation after the study began. He suggested that rather than have any of the Commissions' proposals replace what is suggested for the scope of work, have the consultant comment on the consequences of the Commission's proposal with Growth Policy Implementation. CB suggested adding this as a new section (D).

Don and CB thought the scope of work should include such a thing. Kerry was concerned about being fair to the consultant up front in terms of what was expected of them.

Kerry suggested that part B be revised to reflect any changes that may be made during the upcoming legislative session.

Sean communicated two comments from Greg. The first suggestion was that the scope of work discuss the possibility of developing partnerships (public/private and public/public) for the provision of wastewater treatment. The second suggestion was that the scope of work include a discussion of innovative technologies to assure we get the maximum treatment levels possible.

The group decided not to explore partnerships in the scope of work for this study because the political decisions associated with those partnerships are not engineering questions. The framework established by the scope of work would not preclude partnerships from being established.

4. **Discussion of Great West Engineering Study:** Not discussed.
5. **Member Reports:** Not discussed.
6. **Next meeting Date and Agenda:** Focus discussion on Great West Engineering Study. Next meeting October 6 at 4:00 p.m.
7. **Other Business:** None discussed.
8. **Adjourn:** 6:04 p.m.

F:\PLNG\PLNGBD\Wastewater Committee\Minutes\PB-WWC-9-22-08_minutes.doc